Table 2-H-2
Previous Studies, Primary Statewide Corridors – High-Speed Train Alignment Attainment of Objectives
Los Angeles to the San Francisco Bay Area

OBJECTIVE	ALIGNMENTS **Alignment Name** = Alignment Carried Forward; **Alignment Name** = Alignment Eliminated; = Reason for Elimination Coastal Corridor	Interstate 5 (I-5) Corridor	State Route 99 (SR-99) Corridor
Maximize Ridership / Revenue Potential	1 • Slowest SF-LA travel times – 3:25 to 4:30 depending on alignment option • Serves Coastal Cities/ Communities • Longest route between Los Angeles and San Francisco Bay Area (43%-97% longer than I-5 Corridor) • Least ridership potential: 24-46% less ridership than shortest I-5 option	3 • Fastest SF-LA travel times – 2:23 to 2:31 depending on alignment option • Most direct route between Los Angeles and Northern Markets (San Francisco Bay Area or Sacramento) • No Service to Central Valley Cities (e.g., 20 miles from Bakersfield and 46 miles from Fresno) • Very little projected growth in catchment area	5 • Fast SF-LA Travel times – 2:34-2:47 depending on alignment option • Serves Central Valley Cities • More population served (1 million more than Coastal Corridor and 3-4 million more than I-5 Corridor) • 1.2 million more annual passengers than I-5 Corridor for Major North-South Markets • 3.3 million more annual intermediate market trips than I-5 Corridor
Maximize Connectivity and Accessibility	3 • Serves Coastal Cities/Communities	2 • Does not serve intermediate intercity travel markets	5 • Serves Central Valley Cities
Minimize Operating and Capital Costs	1 • Longest route between Los Angeles and San Francisco Bay Area • Higher capital costs due to length and terrain (22% higher than I-5 Corridor and 12% higher than SR 99 Corridor) • Difficult construction along coastal terrain • Highest amount of steep slope areas • Constrained alignment speeds along coastal areas (maximum speeds of 150 mph)	5 • Shortest route between Los Angeles and San Francisco Bay Area • Lowest capital costs	4 • Marginally Longer route than I-5 • Higher capital cost due to increased length and significantly more urban areas traversed (6% higher than I-5 Corridor)
Maximize Compatibility with Existing and Planned Development	3 • Serves/Impacts developed Coastal communities • Highest potential visual impacts	1 • Traverses primarily undeveloped land	5 • Serves developed Central Valley communities

OBJECTIVE	ALIGNMENTS **Alignment Name** = Alignment Carried Forward **Alignment Name** = Alignment Eliminated = Reason for Elimination **Coastal Corridor**	**Interstate 5 (I-5) Corridor**	**State Route 99 (SR-99) Corridor**
Minimize Impacts on Natural Resources	3	3	3
	• Low impacts on threatened and endangered species • Low impacts on water resources • Highest potential impacts on coastal resources	• Highest potential impacts on threatened and endangered species	• High Potential impacts on waterways and floodplains
Minimize Impacts on Social and Economic Resources	2	3	3
	• Highest potential population disturbance impacts • Highest visual impacts	• Moderate potential impacts on farmland resources • Moderate visual and low population disturbance	• Highest potential impacts on farmland resources • Moderate population disturbance and visual impacts
Minimize Impacts on Cultural Resources	1	5	3
	• Highest potential impacts on historic and cultural resources	• Low potential impacts on historical resources	• Moderate potential impacts on historic resources
Maximize Avoidance of Areas with Geologic and Soils Constraints	3	3	3
	• Crosses least number of active faults • Difficult terrain and soil conditions	• Moderate amount of faults, steep slopes and erodible soils	• Few areas of steep slopes • Many areas with major faults and erodible soils
Maximize Avoidance of Areas with Potential Hazardous Materials	2	5	1
	• Moderate potential impacts on areas with hazardous materials	• Low potential impacts on areas with hazardous materials	• Highest potential impacts on areas with hazardous materials

1 2 3 4 5

Least Favorable **Most Favorable**